

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-10, 12-15, 18-19, 21, 24-40 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 15 and 21 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representatives by Examiner Hillery during the telephone conference held May 18, 2005. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. The claims presented by this amendment correspond with the claims discussed during the telephone conference.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendments amplify a feature already inherent in the claims); (b) satisfy a requirement of form asserted by the Examiner during the May 18 telephone conference; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments were not earlier presented because they are made in response to verbal arguments raised by the Examiner during the May 18 telephone conference. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

**I. Amendments to the Claims**

During the telephone conference, the Examiner agreed that adding the phrase "identified by the link" at the end of each independent claim to clarify that "the injectable control content may be selected by a user to perform a functional operation upon the retrievable item identified by the link" would overcome the cited references.

Applicant's respectfully submits that such an interpretation is already **inherent** in the claims and that such an amendment is, therefore, unnecessary. Nevertheless, for clarity purposes only, the independent claims of the present application (i.e., claims 1, 15 and 21) have been amended to explicitly include this phrase.

Support for claims 1, 15 and 21 may be found throughout the original specification. For example, specific support may be found at least at Fig. 9 and at page 16, lines 8-10, which state:

Fig. 9 shows a third exemplary embodiment of a graphical user interface useable to display injected content according to this invention. As shown in Fig. 9, the graphical user interface 1000 includes an injectionable content bar 1010. The injectable content bar 1010 includes all of the non-selectable injectable content functions, the selectable injectable content functions, and the custom injectable content functions as selected using the graphical user interface shown in Figs. 4 and 5 and the methods outlined in Figs. 2 and 3.

The graphical user interface 1000 illustrates the injectionable content bar 1010 being **displayed adjacent to each link of the web page, for example, as a result of selecting the "add as icon" function, and the "adjacent to each link" location.** (emphasis added)

## II. **§102(e) Rejection**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-10, 13-15, 18, 19, 21, 24 and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,605,120 to Fields et al. ("Fields"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "inserting injectable control content into the received information at a specified location relative to the link to a retrievable item; . . . . wherein the injectable control content may be selected by a user to perform a functional operation upon the retrievable item identified by the link." (Emphasis added.) As discussed during the interview, Applicant respectfully submits that Fields does not disclose,

teach or suggest such a feature. In Fields, the injected control content is not inserted "at a specified location relative to the link," but is inserted at a position relative to the web page as a whole.

Support for claims 1, 15 and 21 may be found throughout the original specification. For example, specific support may be found at page 16, lines 8-10, and Fig. 9, as addressed above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Fields. Claims 15 and 21 include features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1, and are likewise patentably distinguishable over Fields for at least the reasons stated above. The remaining claims depend from one of claims 1, 15 and 21 and are likewise patentably distinguishable over Fields for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### III. §103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Fields in view of U.S. Patent 6,301,586 to Yang et al. ("Yang"). Further, the Office Action rejects claims 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Fields in view of U.S. Patent 6,738,841 to Wolff ("Wolff"). Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 26-29 and 31-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Fields in view of Wolff and further in view of Yang. Yet further, the Office Action rejects claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Fields in view of Wolff and Yang and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,618,163 to Roosen et al. ("Roosen"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, independent claims 1, 15 and 21 recite, *inter alia*, "inserting injectable control content into the received information at a specified location relative to the

**link to a retrievable item**; . . . . wherein the injectable control content may be selected by a user to perform a functional operation **upon the retrievable item identified by the link**."

(Emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully submits that Fields, Yang, Wolff, Roosen do not disclose, teach or suggest such a feature and that such a feature would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made. Therefore, any combination of Fields, Yang, Wolff, Roosen cannot make up for the identified deficiency and cannot be held to anticipate the present invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 15 and 21 are patentably distinguishable over the cited combination. The remaining claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 15 and 21 and therefore include features similar to those described above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining dependent claims are not anticipated by the combinations cited by the Office Action for at least the same reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-10, 12-15, 18-19, 21, 24-40 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Eric D. Morehouse  
Registration No. 38,565

JAO:JMH

Date: July 13, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--